



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/519,601

09/16/2005

Mathijs Theodorus Van De Ven

3135-048013

9486

7590

08/11/2009

William H Logsdon  
Webb Ziesenheim Logsdon Orkin & Hanson  
436 Seventh Avenue  
700 Koppers Building  
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1818

EXAMINER

PRASAD, CHANDRIKA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2839

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/11/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/519,601	<b>Applicant(s)</b> VAN DE VEN, MATHIJS THEODORUS	
	<b>Examiner</b> CHANDRIKA PRASAD	<b>Art Unit</b> 2839	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/30/09.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 19-37 is/are pending in the application.  
     4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 19-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
     a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/30/09</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/30/09 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 19-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. Claim 19 recites the limitation "the gripped cable" in line 9. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 19-24 and 27-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robert (4383239) in view of Berthold et al. (4976157).

Robert shows a gripping means for a line sensor for gripping a signal line 4 comprising at least one rigid component 3 adapted to grip a sleeve of the signal line wherein the gripping means includes a spring element 2 made of a flexible material, which engages and exerts a biasing force on the rigid component and away from the signal line to remove load of or loads on the rigid component . The spring element is embodied as a resilient sleeve on which the rigid component is placed. The spring element is placed between two rigid components 3 and 1. The rigid components are fastened for fastening the gripping means to the signal line. An edge of the rigid component is at right angles to the centre line of the signal line. The gripping means can be released or partially released from the signal line. The gripping means is at least partially combined with the sleeve. The gripping means is provided with a holding member 1 and is remote from the side connected to the signal line. The signal line is influenced by loads on the signal line. The signal line passes in a smooth line in the gripping means. The rigid component forms part of the sleeve. The signal line is embodied in a flexible sealing element.

But Robert does not show signal line to be an optical cable. Optical cables are now-a-days widely used for signal transmission. Berthold shows the use of an optical fiber for such use. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to use an optical cable as a signal line due to its capability to transmit signal at high speed as shown by Berthold and which are widely used now-a-days.

7. Claims 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robert (4383239) as modified by Berthold et al. (4976157) and further in view of Hinze (5703754).

Robert as modified by Berthold shows all the features of these claims except the hardness of the rigid component being between 10 to 100 shores. Materials of such hardness are well known. Hinze discloses the use of materials with such hardness. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to make the rigid component of hardness between 10 to 100 shores as taught by Hinze, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Contact Information***

9. Any correspondence to this action may be mailed to:

**Commissioner for Patents  
Post Office Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chandrika Prasad at (571) 272-2099. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor can be reached at (571) 272-2800 ext 39. The fax number is 571-273-8300.

/Chandrika Prasad/  
Primary examiner  
August 08, 2009